

MSR Stakeholder Working Group
Los Alamitos/Seal Beach/Rossmoor/Sunset Beach Focus Area
May 17, 2004

Meeting Minutes
(approved June 15, 2004)

I. Call to Order:

The meeting began at 6:00 pm. All stakeholders were in attendance, except John Bahorski and Gretchen Hoad.

Facilitator asked if there was anyone from the public wishing to speak. There were no public comments.

Facilitator asked if any working group member had any comments or changes to the draft minutes for the March 24th meeting. There was an addition to point VII: "A working group member requested LAFCO staff to prepare a matrix that lists the breakdown of services provided to the area, their respective costs, and the providers of those services."

Decision Point – Draft Minutes for March 24th Meeting – Adopted by consensus

II. Review Agenda and Desired Outcomes

The facilitator explained the order of the meeting and the desired outcomes.

III. Review of DRAFT "Quality of Life" Criteria

The facilitator indicated that the DRAFT "quality of life" definition/criteria would be reviewed later in the meeting, following the presentation and discussion of trending data.

IV. Recap of MSR Working Group Process

LAFCO staff presented a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the MSR working group process. The presentation included a review of the nine determinations LAFCO will make about present and future opportunities, constraints, and needs.

A member of the working group inquired if the working group would be given an opportunity to review the Commission's nine determinations. Staff responded that yes, the working group would be given an opportunity to review and comment upon the determinations but qualified that the review did not mean that the working group would have the authority to revise or modify the determinations.

V. Presentation of Trending Data

The facilitator introduced the presentation on trending data to be presented by LAFCO consultant Jennifer Christian of Conrad and Business Associates. The facilitator asked the working group members to be mindful of specific gaps, trends, and/or issues that should be considered by the group.

The consultant presented the PowerPoint presentation on trending data to the MSR working group.

➡ Demographics

- A working group member asked for the actual square mileage for each of the designated areas. The consultant directed the working group to refer to the spreadsheets provided the week before.
- A working group member suggested that the consultant omit any land use information related to the military base.
- A working group member expressed surprise at Seal Beach's density statistics. The consultant indicated that she utilized the data provided by CDR.

➡ Housing

- A working group member asked if the housing numbers reflected the rebuilding that had occurred in certain areas. The consultant stated that she utilized 2000 census data.
- A working group member asked how old the rental unit numbers were. The consultant said that she had also pulled those numbers from 2000 census data.
- A working group member point out that the multi-family home shown in the PowerPoint presentation is located in Seal Beach rather than Rossmoor.

➡ Education

- A working group member mentioned that Sunset Beach is located within the Huntington Beach School District.

➡ Land Use

- A working group member asked how the term "open space" was defined. The consultant indicated that she pulled the open space data from the general plans provided by the working group members.
- A working group member expressed concern that some of the open space numbers looked incorrect. The consultant agreed to verify the numbers following the meeting. She added that open space acreage was listed on the previous week's spreadsheet and requested that working group members contact her if they had any changes.
- A working group member stated that he would like to see County-wide, per capita sales tax data. Another inquired the source of the data. The consultant responded that she pulled the data from the financials provided by the working group members.
- A working group member indicated that the sales tax numbers from Seal Beach looked low. The consultant responded that it could be that the numbers don't reflect the sale taxes generated from the new commercial development.

➡ Parks, Beaches, & Recreation

- A working group member indicated that Rossmoor had additional community service district costs, which were detailed in the year-end report that would be provided to the consultant following the meeting.
- A working group member expressed frustration at not being able to understand the numbers the County provided related to Sunset Beach (i.e., how much of the expenses were related to beach maintenance or to landscaping or to restrooms, etc., etc.). He added that it would be difficult to budget without having an accurate depiction of what each specific facet costs the County.

- A working group member asked if the list of recreational programs included those provided by the YMCA. The consultant indicated that it did not. She said that the programs provided by municipal agencies were listed to show the overlaps in program provision.

➡ Police Services

- The consultant indicated that the police data for Seal Beach, Rossmoor, and Sunset Beach was pending and would be presented to the MSR working group when available via email.
- A working group member suggested that the MSR working group explore the idea of joint power authorities (“JPAs”) – i.e., what are the options and limits? Another cited the JPA between the Cities of Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, and Cypress for a merged emergency dispatch center as a successful example.
- A working group member indicated that the numbers provided related to animal control varied significantly. One suggested that the figures should be provided in cost per animal instead of cost per capital, adding that the cost varies significantly based on an agency’s policy (i.e., “kill” vs. “no kill”). Another suggested that the trending data include data on the number of animal licenses issued per each area, as licensing affects the agencies’ overhead costs.

➡ Fire Services

- A working group member mentioned that there is also a fire station on the Los Alamitos military base that should be added to the map included in the presentation.
- The consultant pointed out that the response times reflect the arrival of the first unit responding to the call, be it a paramedic unit or a fire truck.
- Responding to a question posed about the expense of fire services in Seal Beach, a working group member indicated that the high senior population generates a lot of calls.
- The consultant explained the two funding methodologies for the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) – cash proposals vs. structural fire funds.
- Staff representatives from OCFA were present to provide additional feedback regarding the fire authority’s services and costs

➡ Sewer

- A working group member indicated that Leisure World does not pay into Seal Beach’s system but rather maintains its own sewer services through a direct connection with the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD).
- A working group member pointed out that the Southern California Water Company is a private, not public, water system.
- The consultant indicated that Seal Beach’s average residential water charges were pending and would be presented to the MSR working group when available via email.

➡ Traffic

- A working group member expressed concern that the traffic numbers for Seal Beach looked low. The consultant indicated that she had the maps and traffic flow projects from the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) available for review if anyone wanted to see them.

- A working group member suggested that the consultant create two separate slides depicting projected traffic flow data – one for side streets and one for freeways.

➤ Infrastructure

- A working group member indicated that maintenance for Rossmoor's five traffic signals are included in the cities' totals. The consultant indicated that the County also provided its numbers for the maintenance of those same traffic signals – a discrepancy that would have to be investigated following the meeting.
- A working group member suggested that Seal Beach's annual street maintenance costs looked too low. LAFCO staff responded that the figures were pulled directly from the city's budget.
- A working group member indicated that the actual frequency of street maintenance needs to be factored in, as it has a significant impact on the cost per mile maintenance costs (i.e., once per week, twice per month, etc.).

➤ Financial Issues

➤ Property Tax Division

- A working group member pointed out that the pie chart representing Rossmoor added up to more than 100%.
- A working group member asked for a breakdown of the gas tax. The consultant responded that it was included in the spreadsheet distributed the previous week.
- The consultant stated that further requests/questions could be directed to her following the meeting. She added that she would present updated data to the working group in June.

VI. General Discussion of Trending Data

The facilitator initiated the open discussion session related to the trending data presentation.

The MSR working group reiterated its request that LAFCO staff prepare a matrix that lists the services provided to each area and the providers of those services. They asked a series of questions that they wanted the matrix to answer: What is the specific breakdown of "city services" being provided by the County to the unincorporated areas? How much does it cost the County to provide each of those services and, even further, how much does it cost each of the cities to provide those same services? If the information is not available, the working group needs to know.

LAFCO staff cautioned the group regarding the importance of making certain it is comparing "apples to apples." Further elaborated, staff stated that during meetings with city and county staff regarding the data, the representatives requested that it be made clear that services and costs for each area varies within each agency for a number of important reasons and therefore, in some cases you are comparing "apples to oranges."

The working group expressed its difficulty in determining service categories. For example, how does one determine what municipal services fall under the County's line item for "planning," etc.? Not knowing what specific services are being provided (and at what cost) makes it difficult for an unincorporated area to weigh its options.

LAFCO staff agreed to collaborate with the working group members to identify expense categories and determine what services are included in each fee assessed by the County, but added that it's likely that the County would not have any more detailed information than it has already provided for analysis. Staff asked the working group members to email suggested breakdown categories.

LAFCO staff further cautioned that LAFCO doesn't have the staff or the financial resources to conduct a detailed analysis of the JPA between the Cities of Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, and Cypress for a merged emergency dispatch center. Staff suggested that the MSR process was a starting point but encouraged the working group members to collaborate amongst themselves to explore potential avenues of interest in greater detail.

VII. Gap Analysis Working Group Assignments

The facilitator indicated that the gap analysis working group assignments would be addressed at the MSR working group's June meeting. She indicated that the group would first identify the gaps/opportunities and then prioritize them.

III. Review DRAFT "Quality of Life" Criteria

The facilitator returned to discussion item "III," the group's review of the quality of life criteria, deferred earlier in the meeting. LAFCO staff distributed handouts for the working group's consideration. The facilitator requested that the group members review the handouts and email their comments to staff making certain they copied the entire working group. The members are to come to the working group's June meeting prepared to engage in finalizing the criteria. Further, the group was asked to consider how the criteria might be used to help evaluate potential alternatives for addressing any anticipated future focus area service gaps.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting concluded shortly before 9:00 p.m.